

REMARKS

In the amendments above, Claims 1 to 8 have been cancelled in favor of newly added Claims 9 to 29, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. Support for newly added Claims 9 to 29 can be found in, for example, Claims 1 to 8.

According to the Office Action, Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackson, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20030041028 ("Blackson") in view of Jones, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20040016797 ("Jones"). The Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to incorporate Jones' teaching into Blackson's self-service banking apparatus for the purpose of providing a wide range of features and services.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackson as modified by Jones in view of Hilt, U.S. Patent No. 6,408,284 ("Hilt"). The Examiner maintains that Blackson as modified by Jones disclosed the self-service banking apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the depositary module permits the automatic accomplishment of multiple operations and functions simultaneously including: check and/or currency deposits in envelopes individual check deposits, currency deposits, currency recycling and supply, etc., in single equipment; that Hilt, however, discloses that the automatic accomplishment of multiple operations and functions includes bill payments; and that, therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate Hilt's teaching into self-service banking apparatus of Blackson as modified by Jones for the purposes of providing a wide range of features and services.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections.

The claims have been reconfigured above to emphasize distinctions over the prior art, which describe nor suggest some characteristics of the present invention. For example, the presently claimed invention has a characteristic comprising a deposited

document accumulator device (10) associated to the device (11), which give back the documents to the user, in case the user ceases the operation.

In addition, the presently claimed system comprises a document duplicity detector (3), which, possibly due to an error of interpretation by Examiner, was considered equivalent to the device 700 described in Jones, paragraphs 0118, 0155, 0156, a relevant portion of which reads as follows:

“the device 700 is programmed to halt or suspend operation when a non-genuine currency bill or invalid substitute currency medium is detected ...”
[emphasis added]

The device described in Jones refers to the detection of fake or counterfeit currency bills or invalid substitute currency media, which is not the case of the document duplicity detector (3) of the present invention. As set forth in paragraph 0034 of the instant application, which reads as follows:

“... a document duplicity detector (3) able to detect the eventual introduction of double page, ...”

the final function is to detect the eventual introduction of double pages of checks in the device. This problem occurs more often when the user inadvertently detaches two sheets from the checkbook.


The claimed system also comprises two modular organized cassettes (13) and (17) interconnected by the bill conveyor (16), allowing that the bills deposited by one user in a deposit operation are used by another user, in an withdrawing operation. This characteristic is also not described in the prior documents pointed by the Examiner.

The newly added claims are not suggested or described by the references identified by the Examiner. Therefore, the rejections under 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims herein are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

August 3, 2007


William H. Dippert
Registration No. 26,723

Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
250 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10177-0030
Telephone: 212.986.1116; Facsimile: 212.986.0604
e-Mail: wdippert@wolfblock.com